

### REMARKS

Examiner objections with respect to the abstract and the disclosure have been addressed with the amendments to the specification described above. Also, claim 19 has been amended above to address a punctuation error, objected to by the Examiner. Furthermore, and also unrelated to patentability, the applicants have canceled claims 33-37 to reduce the number of pending claims and therefore to reduce the expenses related the present application.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 25, 27 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kim (U.S. Patent Number 6,215,791) and claims 12-14, 16-22, 26, 29, 30, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kim and further in view of Wacławsky (U.S. Patent Number 6,449,255). Respectfully disagreeing with these rejections, reconsideration is requested by the applicants. Nonetheless, the applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 to more clearly highlight the patentability of the present invention over the prior art but not to narrow their scope.

Independent claim 1 recites "inserting a time-delay indication into a portion of the first information packet, the time-delay indication corresponding to the period of time that the first information packet **was stored in the router.**" Independent claim 11 recites, "the indication of the desired transcoder transmission time being based on a period of time that at least one prior information packet of the first communication **was stored in the router.**" Independent claim 19 recites "receiving an information packet from the router, the information packet including a time-delay indication, and the time-delay indication corresponding to a period of time that the information packet **was stored in the router.**" Independent claim 25 recites "inserting a time-delay indication into a portion of the information packet, the time-delay indication corresponding to the period of time that the information packet **was stored in the router.**" Independent claim 29 recites "receiving an indication of a desired transcoder transmission time for the additional information packet, the indication being based on a period of time that the at

least one information packet of the first group of information packets was stored in the router." Thus, the independent claims refer to an indication of a period of time for which a packet is actually stored by the router.

The Examiner appears to assert that Kim teaches this claim language, citing column 5 lines 26-50 and column 6 lines 15-22. Kim column 5 lines 26-50 reads as follows (emphasis added):

FIG. 6 illustrates a priority-address pair in accordance with the present invention. A priority field bisects itself into areas for a deadline time and for an eligible time, respectively. The deadline time can be defined as a **maximum allowable delay bound** at a node in a broadband integrated service digital network (B-ISDN). The deadline time at a node is determined on condition that the sum of all the deadline times cannot exceed a source-to-destination delay bound. If a cell under transmission exceeds the deadline time at a node, the end-to-end bound may not be kept, thereby the cell being regarded as useless. The eligible time refers to a **delay bound in which a cell is supposed to be transmitted from a node**, being determined by taking account of a jitter. It is defined by a following mathematical formula.

[Mathematical Formula]

$$ET_{ij}^k = ET_{i-1,j}^k + d_{i-1,j} + t_i,$$

wherein, the  $ET_{ij}^k$  denotes an eligible time assigned to a cell  $k$  for a channel  $j$  at a node  $i$ ; the  $ET_{i-1,j}^k$  denotes an eligible time assigned to the cell  $k$  for the channel  $j$  at a node  $i-1$ ; the  $d_{i-1,j}$  represents a deadline time for the channel  $j$  at the node  $i-1$ ; and the  $t_i$  refers to a propagation delay between the node  $i-1$  and the node  $i$ . The above formula represents that the eligible time of cell  $k$  at node  $i$  depends on the eligible time and the deadline time of the previous node  $i-1$ .

Kim column 6 lines 15-22 reads as follows:

The sequencer in accordance with the present invention sequentially compares first the deadline time of a new entry with that of the entries the sequencer has been keeping. An entry with smaller value of the deadline time is arranged right-side of an entry with larger deadline time. In case that the deadline times are same, the eligible times are compared, and then, an entry with a smaller value of the eligible time is arranged to be at the right-side than an entry with larger eligible time.

Thus, Kim appears to teach time requirements that are "assigned" to a node rather than indications of times for which a packet is actually stored by a router. The applicants submit that this is a fundamental difference between the prior art and the present claims and that the application of the teachings and/or suggestions of Kim to the Applicant's admitted prior art would not result in what is claimed. However, if the Examiner believes that the applicants have misunderstood Kim or missed some nuance in Kim, the

applicants request that the Examiner provide a detailed explanation supporting such a belief.

Since none of the references cited, either independently or in combination, teach all of the limitations of the independent claims, or therefore, all the limitations of their respective dependent claims, it is asserted that neither anticipation nor a prima facie case for obviousness has been shown. No remaining grounds for rejection or objection being given, the claims in their present form are asserted to be patentable over the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Therefore, allowance and issuance of this case is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, if such communication would advance the prosecution of the present application. Lastly, please charge any additional fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117 – Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,  
M. Bychowsky et al.

By: 

Jeffrey K. Jacobs  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 44,798  
Phone No.: 847/576-5562  
Fax No.: 847/576-3750

-45-

**METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR IMPROVING PERCEIVED SIGNAL QUALITY  
OF TRANSMITTED INFORMATION IN A FULL DUPLEX WIRELESS  
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM**

**ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE**

5

A full duplex wireless communication system (100) one or more wireless communication devices (101) and fixed infrastructure equipment that includes at least a transcoder (201), a router (203) and a base transceiver site (BTS, 103). To reduce delays of information packets communicated between the transcoder and the BTS, the transcoder, router and BTS employ a unique synchronization-based priority scheme. In accordance with the priority scheme, an indication of the status of synchronization between the transcoder and the BTS is included in an information packet to guide the router's processing of the packet. In the event that the router stores the packet, the router preferably inserts a time-delay indication into a portion of the packet. The BTS uses the time-delay indication to determine a desired transcoder transmission time, and communicates an indication of the desired transcoder transmission time to the transcoder.

10

15